HONOLULU HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT	REVIEWER: Hawaii Department of Transportation
COMMENT SHEET	DATE: PAGE 1 of
DOCUMENT NAME AND DATE:	RESPONDER:
	DATE:

COMMENT NUMBER	SECTION NO. / PAGE NO.	COMMENT TYPE	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION CODE	RESPONSE CODE
1	7.1.1/7-1	M	For design of traffic signal structures, add the following: AASHTO: Standard Specifications for Structural Supports for Highway Signs, Luminaires and Traffic Signals, including modifications contained in HDOT document "Design Criteria for Bridges and Structures"			
2	6.6.2/6-8		Add red italicized text: "The roadway and geometric…having jurisdiction and *the current version of* the applicable Standards, Manuals, …"			
3	6.6.4.1/6-10		Delete: "In cases of significant constraint, a width reduction may be necessary." Note: No reduction below the minimum will be allowed.			
4	6.6.4.2/6-11		Note: The number of lanes shall not be less than the number that exists pre-construction.			
5	6.7.2/6-15		Under Section 2: Runoff Quantity, there may be incorrect references to Subsections 6.8.1.A and 6.8.1.B.			
6	6.7.2/6-16		At top of page, add red italicized text: "Water Permanent Best…March 2007 for exceptions *and variances*."			
7	6.7.3/6-16		For table, follow criteria shown in Chapter 1 of the State Drainage Criteria for areas impacting the State Drainage Systems.			
8	6.7.4/6-16		How was "The maximum permissible flow width for gutter in a parking area is 12-ft." determined?			
9	6.7.4/6-17		At top of page, Section C: "Street drainage shall be designed…" Follow State Criteria if impacting State system.			
10	6.7.4/6-17		Section D.2. List of minimum slopes should be changed to:			

			b. Laterals 0.5% c. Main Collectors 0.5% d. Ditches 0.5% (0.5% for State owned system)			
11	6.7.4/6-17		Section D.3. "Individual subdrain runs shall not exceed ~~300~~ 250 ft."			
12	6.7.5/6-17		Unsure what entire Section A: "Drainage Structures, except for parking lots, shall…standards is permissible." Means.			
13	6.7.5/6-18		Note: Follow applicable FHWA HEC Manuals for State owned systems.			
14	6.7.6/6-18		Incorrect reference to Section 6.8.1.A and 6.8.1.B?			
15			The DOT has a pipeline policy that prohibits the abandonment of pipelines and utilities' facilities on all DOT properties. This may need to be reflected somewhere in the design criteria. Copy of policy is attached for reference.			
16			The DOT imposes certain requirements/restrictions for utilities proposed at existing bridges and within our right-of-way. Attached are some notes that we use where utilities are proposed near or on our bridges. Please include applicable provisions in your design criteria. Verify with our Right Of Way Branch for other restrictions.			
17	6.6.9/6-13	M	Submit Chapter 11 for review			
18	8.3.1.L.4/8-4	M	Utility final design reviewed by DOT			
19	8.3.3.A.1/8-5	M	"DPP-CEB OR HDOT" should be "DPP-CEB AND HDOT"			
20			Whatever is installed needs to be maintained to a level of service acceptable to the State.			
21			Would be nice to have the City maintain the landscaping under their structure.			
23	Page 1-16, Table 1-3		With average speed in the 30's mph, it's LOS F. Zipperlane has average speed of 50 mph with a LOS D. The average speed and LOS level doesn't seem to make sense.			
24	Page 2-8, 1st paragraph		"The four panel members eliminated proprietary technologies, meaning that selection of one of those technologies would			

			have required all future purchases of vehicles or equipment to be from a single manufacturer." This reason, which limits the alternatives that is evaluated in the DEIS, is troubling. Proprietary technologies, by itself, aren't sufficient reason to eliminate an alternative. More substantial reasons, such as costs, operational characteristics not meeting purpose and need, etc., are needed.			
25	Page 3-44, Section 3.5.5		Construction-related Effects on Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities: Access to existing HDOT's bicycle and pedestrian facilities during construction needs to remain. In addition, warning and/or notification signs of modifications to HDOT's bicycle and pedestrian facilities during the construction period is needed.			
26	Page 4-32, Section 6(f) Resources		While this section states that there's no 6(f) resources along the alignment, Neal S. Blaisdell Park have a plaque at the entrance stating that Land, Water, Conservation Funds was used, making it a 6(f) property.			
27	Page 4-111, Wildlife Survey along the Alignment:		Wildlife field surveys and observations were conducted in September 2007 and bird point counts were conducted from December 2007 to January 2008. Depending when in the month done, these surveys could misses the peak seabird fallout period (September 15 – December 15 annually) when nocturnally flying seabirds, especially fledgling on the way to sea, can become disoriented by exterior lighting. When disoriented, seabirds often collide with manmade structures, and if they are not killed outright, the dazed or injured birds are easy targets of opportunity for feral mammals. Of concerns are the following three pelagic seabird species, Hawaiian Petrel (Pterodroma sandwichensis), Newell's Shearwater (Puffinus auricularis newelli), and Band-rumped Storm-Petrel (Oceanodroma castro). The petrel is listed as an endangered species, the shearwater as a threatened species, and the storm-petrel is a candidate species under the Endangered Species Act.			

			Recommend bird counts be done at night during the peak fallout period.			
28	Page 4-149, Wildlife:		Dependent on the result of bird counts stated under Item 5 above, restriction for night work could be required during the peak seabird fallout period.			
29	Farrington Highway Maintenance of Traffic: Traffic Analysis (MOT) Sect. 5.0 - Conclusion		Intersection operation is only one aspect of the system. The Conclusion discusses impacts to the intersections, but does not adequately discuss potential impacts to H-1 and the rest of Farrington Highway. Diversion of traffic that will be impacted on Farrington Hwy. to the H-1 Freeway does not seem very feasible considering, on any given day, traffic on H-1 in that area during peak periods is already bad and inconsistent, especially in the WB direction, in the PM.			
30	Figures 1-2 and 4-1 of MOT Traffic Analysis		Recommend more detailed disclosure on additional peak hours for the weekdays and weekends to inform the public of the congestion delays due to construction of the project, and mitigative measures taken. We did a quick analysis and determined there may be peak period up to 6 hours. This disclosure and analysis should be considered for both the under corridors constructed and parallel corridors. Additionally, historical counts from past DOT traffic counts in the area indicate that the WB traffic in that area of Farrington have been higher! From 2001-2006 (with the exception of 2005), the average PM peak hour volume is about 1536 vph (ranging from 1390 vph in 2004 to 1723 vph in 2006)! This amplifies the possible impacted noted above in comment #30.			
31			Follow up to comment #30: This is not a standard lane with 1300 capacity, it is a lane through a major construction zone, may have lots of side friction, distraction, etc that will reduce actual capacity.			

32			Also, what happens at the lane drop from 2 lanes to 1. The ripple effect will back up on to the freeway. Based on numbers below, they are saying that WB peak hour increases by only 32 vehicles in 5-years, highly questionable. Numbers themselves don't match historically so they are questionable.			
33	6.3/6.2-6-25	M	Submit CH. 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6 6.7, 6.8 for review.			
34	6.3.1/6-2	M	Supply ROW maps, metes and bounds, sample type documents, etc. for review and compliance with Uniform Act, FTA and FHWA rules, regulations, codes, etc.			
35	6.3.2/6-2	M	Add type: U&O agreements, UA agreements, access restrictions, right of entry documents, master MOA, MOUS, etc.			
36	6.3 to 6.8	M	Provided funding source for State involvement, contact personnel, tracking system availability, oversight agreement, consultant sources, technology changes, etc.			
37	6.3.3/6-3	M	Define ROW criteria and limits, agreements, private owner and C&C Hon. Indemnification and responsibility outside ROW, etc.			
38	6.4/6-7	M	Access control adjustments, agreements, location, identification, documentation, maintenance, jurisdiction, physical barriers identified, responsibility,			
39	6.5//6-8	M	Identification of location and responsibilities, funding, communication and State approvals.			
40	6.6/6-8	M	Maintenance and liability agreements, responsibilities, additional ROW requirements.			
41	6.7/6-13	M	Agreements for drainage, liability, where water diverting, ESMTS, BMPS, MS4, controls, sample documents, etc.			
42	6.8/6-20	M	Revocable permits, use and occupancy agreements, right of entries should ROW be needed within and/or outside ROW.			
43	8.0/8-ii	M	Utility agreements, pipeline policies, compliance with State and Federal laws, compliance with public utilities, and francise laws, cost sharing, upgrades, undergrounding issues resolved, identification of all utilities within the ROW, maintenance and liability			

			agreements, etc.			
44			Since proposed route appears to front the Honolulu Harbor near Piers 7-17 within the Highways right of way, HAR-EP would like to be a continued party in any further review to assure that access to our piers along Nimitz Highway is maintained.			
45			In addition they recommend that coordination with ATDC also be established as previous developers have included improvements along Nimitz Highway near the downtown station.			
46			AIR-EP has no comments on the EIS for the Airport Alternative			

COMMENT TYPE: E - Editorial
D - Discretionary
M - Mandatory

ACTION CODES: A - Initiator agrees and will comply / take action
B - Initiator disagrees for reasons noted: discussion may be required
C - Answer provided; no action needed

RESPONSE CODE: A - Accept
N - Not acceptable
D - Discussion Required